

REMARKS

Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 5 and 11 through 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6271752 (Vaios). Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 16, 17 and 20 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios in view of USPN 6,772,169 (Kaplan). Examiner has rejected claims 8, 18 and 19 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios in view of USPN 6,442,248 (Davis). Applicant has amended the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as to the claims as amended.

In the discussion below, Applicant points out subject matter in each of the independent claims that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. On the basis of this, Applicant believes all the claims are patentable over Vaios, Kaplan, Davis and any combination thereof.

Discussion of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 sets out a method by which a portable computer in a sleep mode responds to a wireless communication. In response to the wireless communication, the portable communication wakes from the sleep mode. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan does not discuss a sleep mode and does not disclose or suggest any action being taken upon waking from a sleep mode.

In Vaios, a local computer system 12 is connected via a camera adapter 116 to a video camera 10. The connection allows video, sound and motion

sensor data to be transmitted from the camera to the local computer system. See column 3, lines 24 through 32. In Vaios, local computer system 12 remains idle in sleep mode until “awakened” by a motion sensor obstruction in step 304. See column 8, lines 36 through 45. Vaios does not disclose or suggest a portable communication waking from a sleep mode in response to a wireless communication.

Claim 1 also indicates that the portable computer responds to the wireless communication by generating an event notification message, and transmitting the event notification message to an external device separate from the portable computer. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan discloses querying data records from a database (see column 2, lines 36,37) and displaying the data records on the wireless device (see column 2, lines 43,44). However, Kaplan does not disclose or suggest that an event notification message is generated in response to the wireless communication, nor does Kaplan disclose or suggest transmitting such an event notification message.

Vaios discloses receipt of video data and notification of an alarm to a remote individual. See block 310 and column 8, lines 53 through 56. However, this notification is triggered by a motion sensor alarm (see column 8, lines 38 through 41), and is not generated in response to a wireless communication. Neither Vaios nor Kaplan disclose or suggest that a portable computer

responds to the wireless communication by generating an event notification message as set out in claim 1.

Discussion of Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 sets out storage media storing software which when executing on a portable computer performs a method by which the portable computer responds to a wireless communication. In response to the wireless communication, the portable communication wakes from the sleep mode. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan does not discuss a sleep mode and does not disclose or suggest any action being taken upon waking from a sleep mode.

In Vaios, a local computer system 12 is connected via a camera adapter 116 to a video camera 10. The connection allows video, sound and motion sensor data to be transmitted from the camera to the local computer system. See column 3, lines 24 through 32. In Vaios, local computer system 12 remains idle in sleep mode until “awakened” by a motion sensor obstruction in step 304. See column 8, lines 36 through 45. Vaios does not disclose or suggest a portable communication waking from a sleep mode in response to the wireless communication.

Claim 11 also indicates that the portable computer responds to the wireless communication by generating an event notification message, and

transmitting the event notification message to an external device separate from the portable computer. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan discloses querying data records from a database (see column 2, lines 36,37) and displaying the data records on the wireless device (see column 2, lines 43,44). However, Kaplan does not disclose or suggest that an event notification message is generated in response to the wireless communication, nor does Kaplan disclose or suggest transmitting such an event notification message.

Vaios discloses receipt of video data and notification of an alarm to a remote individual. See block 310 and column 8, lines 53 through 56. However, this notification is triggered by a motion sensor alarm (see column 8, lines 38 through 41), and is not generated in response to a wireless communication. Neither Vaios nor Kaplan disclose or suggest a portable computer responds to the wireless communication by generating an event notification message as set out in claim 11.

Discussion of Independent Claim 19

Claim 11 sets out a method performed by a computing system. The method includes waking the computing system from a sleep mode upon receiving a cellular phone call to the computing system. This is not disclosed or suggested by Vaios or Davis.

Davis does not discuss a sleep mode and does not disclose or suggest any action being taken upon waking from a sleep mode.

In Vaios, a local computer system 12 is connected via a camera adapter 116 to a video camera 10. The connection allows video, sound and motion sensor data to be transmitted from the camera to the local computer system. See Vaios at column 3, lines 24 through 32. In Vaios, local computer system 12 remains idle in sleep mode until “awakened” by a motion sensor obstruction in step 304. See Vaios at column 8, lines 36 through 45. Vaios does not disclose or suggest a portable communication waking from a sleep mode in response to a cellular call.

Claim 19 also sets out provision of a pop-up window that displays information pertaining to the phone call. The pop-up window is for display to a user upon the user awakening the computing system. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Vaios does not disclose or suggest pop-up windows or displaying information pertaining to a phone call.

Davis discloses a caller identification information appearing on a pop-up window. See column 16, lines 3 through 8. However, this pop-up occurs during the course of a modem communication session. See column 15, lines 37 through column 16, line 8. Davis does not disclose or suggest a pop-up window that is for display to a user upon the user awakening the computing system, as set out in claim 19.

Discussion of Independent Claim 20

Claim 20 sets out a method by a portable computer. In response to receiving an inquiry from an external device, the portable computer wakes from a sleep mode. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan does not discuss a sleep mode and does not disclose or suggest any action resulting in a portable computer waking from a sleep mode.

In Vaios, local computer system 12 remains idle in sleep mode until “awakened” by a motion sensor obstruction in step 304. See column 8, lines 36 through 45. Vaios does not disclose or suggest a portable communication waking from a sleep mode in response to an inquiry from an external device.

Claim 20 also indicates that the portable computer responds to the inquiry by generating an event notification message. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Kaplan discloses querying data records from a database (see column 2, lines 36,37) and displaying the data records on the wireless device (see column 2, lines 43,44). However, Kaplan does not disclose or suggest generating an event notification message.

Vaios discloses receipt of video data and notification of an alarm to a remote individual. See block 310 and column 8, lines 53 through 56. However, this notification is triggered by a motion sensor alarm (see column 8, lines 38 through 41), and is not generated in response to an inquiry from an external


device. Neither Vaio nor Kaplan disclose or suggest a portable computer responds to inquiry from an external device by generating an event notification message as set out in claim 20.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this Amendment has placed the present case in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY R. OAR
GREGORY J. MAY

By 
Douglas L. Weller
Reg. No. 30,506

January 25, 2005
Santa Clara, California
(408) 985-0642